



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,048	10/21/2004	Kari Pulkkinen	0365-0609PUS1	8405
2292	7590	09/18/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				KAZIMI, HANI M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
09/18/2009			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/512,048	PULKKINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hani Kazimi	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 17-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 17-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on May 27, 2009. Claims 17-23 are pending. The rejections cited are as stated below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 17-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odijk et al (USPAP 20020156732) in view of Titus (USPAP 20020029189) and further in view of Wallenius (USPN 6760417).

Claims 17-20 and 22-23; Odijk teaches a method for managing customer accounts in connection with a Pre-Paid platform comprising the steps of: receiving, at a proxy, a request for service from a subscriber (*¶ 0025 “receiving the customer request for the content service by a mediator”, 0045, 0048*); Odijk does not explicitly teach determining, at a proxy, a service code associated with a requested service; sending charge data, including the service code, to a charging module; converting, in the charging module, the received charge data and service code into a predefined format accepted by a Pre-Paid platform; sending the converted charge data to the Pre-Paid platform; receiving an indication from the Pre-Paid platform as to whether the subscriber has an adequate balance to cover the requested service; and controlling, by the proxy, whether or nor the requested service is provided based on the received indication.

Titus teaches the concept of determining, at a proxy, a service code associated with a requested service; sending charge data, including the service code, to a charging module; sending the converted charge data to the Pre-Paid platform; receiving an indication from the Pre-Paid platform as to whether the subscriber has an adequate balance to cover the requested service; and controlling, by the proxy, whether or nor the requested service is provided based on the received indication (abstract, *¶ 0021-0022, 0031, 0034-0036, 0042-0043, 0063*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Odijk to include the concepts of prepaid short messaging as taught by Titus for the obvious reason of determining the exact cost of the service

upfront and thus the risk of overdrawing a particular account balance is reduced or eliminated (Titus: ¶0063).

Wallenius teaches the concept of converting, in the charging module, the received charge data and service code into a predefined format accepted by a Pre-Paid platform (col. 2, lines 13-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Odijk to include this concept for the obvious reason of providing charging data in format that is understandable to the prepaid platform.

Caims 20-21; both Odijk and Titus fail to teach that the converted charged data is sent to the prepaid platform using an INAP protocol or CAP protocol.

Official notice is hereby taken that the use of these protocol are old and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Odijk to include these concepts based on the various benefits and functionalities associated with these protocols.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Hani M. Kazimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691